

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 9, 10, 12, 16, 18, 23, 26, 28-31, 33-35, 38-44, 47, 49-51, 53-54, 57, 59, 62, 64, 68-72, 75, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 89-93 are pending in this application, claims 94-96, 98, 100-102, 105, 106, 108-110, 113, and 125 having been previously been withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement. All pending claims have been rejected.

By this amendment and remarks, Applicants have canceled claims 33, 34, 68, 69, 94-96, 98, 100-102, 105, 106, 108-110, 113, and 125 without prejudice and amended claims 1, 2, 26, 70 and 71. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and a timely indication of allowance are respectfully requested.

Independent Claims	Dependent Claims	Statutory Basis	Cited Reference(s)	Discussed Starting on Page
1, 26		112, 2 nd ¶		14
1, 26, 68, 69, 70	10, 12, 16, 18, 23, 26, 28-31, 33-35, 38-44, 47, 49-51, 53, 54, 57, 59, 70, 72, 78, 80, 82	103(a)	Baranowski/Sim	15
	2, 3, 9, 71, and 75	103(a)	Baranowski/Sim/ Helbling	20
	62, 64	103(a)	Baranowski/Sim/ Waytena	22
	83, 85, 89, 90, 92, 93	103(a)	Baranowski/Sim/Fulcher et al.	22
	91	103(a)	Baranowski/Sim/Fulcher et al./Waytena et al.	25

Rejection of Claims 1 and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, the Examiner states that in claim 1, the limitation “the attraction” does not have proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 to change “the attraction” to “one of the attractions.” This amendment provides clarity and finds support in the preamble of the claim as filed.

The Examiner also states that in claim 26, the limitation “working in conjunction with a non-reservation queue to maximize attraction capacity by filling non-reserved seats with waiting guests” is vague and indefinite. Applicants have amended claim 26 to recite “admitting guests from a non-reservation queue to maximize attraction capacity by filling non-reserved seats with waiting guests.” Full support for this amendment is found in the specification and drawings as filed, for example on page 13, lines 1 to 10 of the specification.

No new matter has been added. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requests. In view of the amendments to claims 1 and 26, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s rejection has been obviated and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1, 10, 12, 16, 18, 23, 26, 28-31, 33-35, 38-44, 47, 49-51, 53, 54, 47, 59, 68-70, 72, 78, 80, and 82 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 10, 12, 16, 18, 23, 26, 28-31, 33-35, 38-44, 47, 49-51, 53, 54, 47, 59, 68-70, 72, 78, 80, and 82 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,608) in view of Sim (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,786). Applicants have canceled claims 33, 34, 68 and 69 without prejudice, but address this rejection as to the remaining claims. In view of the amendments to claims 1, 26 and 70, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 2 to recite “an input/output device having a money receiver to enable said input/output device to receive cash and credit card payments.” In the current rejection of claim 2, the Examiner admits that neither Baranowski or Sim teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Baranowski and Sim alone and in combination. Claims 10, 12, 16, 18, and 23 depend from claim 1 and by definition contain all of the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10, 12, 16, 18, and 23 are patentable over Baranowski and Sim for the reasons given above for claim 1 as well as because of the additional limitations contained therein.

For example, claim 10 recites that the maintenance unit comprises “an input device to enable employees to manually input data into the maintenance unit. The Examiner admits that Baranowski fails to explicitly teach this limitation, but the Examiner cites to the portable device used by guests as fulfilling this limitation. However, this is the same structure cited for the “input/output” device of claim 1, which is a separate element. Thus, the Examiner is citing a single structure in Baranowski for meeting two different claimed structures. Moreover, there is no basis for asserting that the portable device used by guests is capable of enabling employees to manually input data into the maintenance unit as claimed. Baranowski does not teach or suggest this possible use for the portable device used by guests. Applicants submit that Sim fails to remedy this defect of Baranowski.

Dependent claim 10 should therefore be allowed, or if claim 1 is not also allowed, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claim 16 requires, *inter alia*:

a display monitor linked to said controller unit to enable guests to view and access wait times for non-reservation queue and next available times for reservation queues, personal information, and park information.

The Examiner references the portable device 100 which allows a customer to view

an itinerary, time until the next or any subsequent reservation, an interactive map, and schedule the next reservation for the next available time. However, the portable device is not linked to the controller unit, nor is it configured “to enable guests to view and access wait times for non-reservation queue”. Therefore, claim 16 requires a limitation that is not present in the attraction computer of Baranowski. Sim fails to remedy this defect of Baranowski. Dependent claim 16 should therefore be allowed, or if claim 1 is not also allowed, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate that claim 16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Independent claim 26 has been amended to recite “wherein said selection is limited by a limited number of selections from a particular category of attractions categorized by geography or popularity.” Applicants submit that this limitation is substantially similar to the limitations of claims 33 and 34 which have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

With regard to claim 34, the Examiner admits that Baranowski does not explicitly disclose where selection may be limited by a limited number of selections from a particular category of attractions categorized by geography or popularity. However, the Examiner states that Sim discloses that a park manager may limit a number of hours of access to a particular activity and that it may be policy that every user gets a minimum number of rides depending on time of registration, so it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention of Baranowski to include the claimed limitation so that all customers can get a chance to visit a particular attraction. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Neither Sim nor Baranowski teach or suggest limiting the number of selections from a particular category of attractions categorized by geography or popularity. Additionally, neither Sim or Baranowski teaches that all customers should get a chance to visit a particular attraction. There is no motivation to modify the invention of Baranowski to have the claimed limitation outside of Applicants’ disclosure. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is patentable over Baranowski

and Sim, both alone and in combination.

Claims 28-31, 35, 38-44, 47, 49-51, 53, 54, 47, 59 depend from claim 26 and by definition contain all of the limitations of claim 26. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 28-31, 35, 38-44, 47, 49-51, 53, 54, 47, 59 are patentable over Baranowski and Sim for the reasons given above for claim 26 as well as because of the additional limitations contained therein. Applicants note that with regard to each of claims 35, 38-44, 50, and 51, the Examiner admits that Baranowski does not explicitly teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claim, but Examiner cites to different teachings to somehow suggest that it would be obvious to modify Baranowski to satisfy the claimed limitations. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the only motivation to modify Baranowski as proposed by the Examiner is impermissibly obtained from Applicants' own disclosure.

Applicants have amended claim 70 to incorporate the limitation of claim 71 of "an input/output device having a money receiver to enable said input/output device to receive cash and credit card payments." In the current rejection of claim 71, the Examiner admits that neither Baranowski or Sim teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 70, as amended, is patentable over Baranowski and Sim alone and in combination. Claims 72, 78, 80, and 82 depend from claim 70 and by definition contain all of the limitations of claim 70. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 72, 78, 80, and 82 are patentable over Baranowski and Sim for the reasons given above for claim 70 as well as because of the additional limitations contained therein.

In view of the amendments to claims 1, 26 and 70, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 10, 12, 16, 18, 23, 26, 28-31, 35, 38-44, 47, 49-51, 53, 54, 47, 59, 70, 72, 78, 80, and 82 are patentable over Baranowski and Sim and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 3, 9, 71 and 75 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 2, 3, 9, 71 and 75 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,608) in view of Sim (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,786) in further view of Helbling et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,797,126). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit Helbling et al. fail to remedy the defects of Baranowski and Sim with regard to claims 1 and 70 as amended.

The Examiner admits that Baranowski and Sim fail to teach or suggest an input/output device having: a money receiver to enable the input/output device to receive cash and credit card payments; and a printer to print tickets or information from the input/output device. However, the Examiner cites to Helbling to remedy these defects of Baranowski and Sim. Helbling is directed to an automatic theater ticket concierge which allows users to purchase and print theater tickets. However, Helbling does not teach or suggest a money receiver to receive cash as claimed. The ability to accept cash, while not critical for theater ticket purchases which are typically relatively expensive, is advantageous in the amusement park setting where the user can be purchasing relatively inexpensive items.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would have no motivation to combine the money receiver and printer taught by Helbling with the devices taught by Baranowski and Sim. The combination of these references would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, because each teaches away from the other. In Baranowski and Sim there would be absolutely no reason to add a feature to the portable devices to accept money, as recited in claims 1 and 70 as amended, because the devices are provided to patrons after they enter the park. The portable devices are intended to be unobtrusively carried inside the park, while the kiosks of Helbling et al are fixed and stationary, outside of the venue. The portable devices are issued after money is paid to enter the park, while the kiosks are used before entry. It is not even clear how cash could be stuffed into a portable device as taught by Baranowski and Sim. Claims 1 and 70 as

amended should therefore be allowed.

Claims 2, 3, 9, 71 and 75 should be allowed as dependent upon allowable claims and because of the additional limitations contained therein.

For example, with regard to claims 2 and 71, Baranowski and Sim teach away from having the portable devices print separate tickets, because the portable devices replace tickets. See, Sim, col. 11, lines 24 to 54. Also, there would be no reason or motivation to add any feature to dispense guest cards as recited in claim 71, as the portable devices taught by Baranowski and Sim supplant the need for separate guest cards. Guest cards are not tickets, as in Helbling et al. The tickets of Helbling et al cannot have value added to them, as can guest cards, for example. Thus, if their respective independent claims are not also allowed, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate that claims 2 and 71 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 62 and 64 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 62 and 64 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,608) in view of Sim (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,786) in further view of Waytena et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,770). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 62 and 64 depend from claim 26 and by definition contain all of the limitations of claims 26. As explained above, Baranowski and Sim fails to teach or suggest “wherein said selection may be limited by a limited number of selections from a particular category of attractions categorized by geography or popularity” as recited in claim 26. Applicants respectfully submit that Waytena fails to remedy this defect of Baranowski and Sim.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 62 and 64 are patentable over Baranowski, Sim and Waytena considered alone and in combination. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 83, 85, 89, 90, 92 and 93 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 83, 85, 89, 90, 92 and 93 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,608) in view of Sim (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,786) in further view of Fulcher et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0132288). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 83 further limits the controller of claim 70 with the limitations, *inter alia*, of:

a queue system linked to said controller unit to control entry into the ***parking lot*** of the park, the park itself, and individual attractions and further comprises:

a ***parking lot queue*** for allowing guests who ***pre-purchased parking passes***;

a ***park queue*** for allowing pre-sale attraction package holders to enter ***the park*** without any lines.

The Examiner admits that Baranowski fails to teach or suggest these limitations, but cites to Fulcher et al. to remedy the defects of Baranowski. Applicants respectfully submit that Fulcher et al. fail to disclose the recited limitations of claim 83 reproduced above. The Examiner states that Fulcher et al. disclose pre-paying for a parking pass that allows access to a parking lot through a gate, at paragraphs 0100; 0101 and 0120. Applicants have reviewed the portions cited by the Examiner and find that paragraph 100 teaches that a driver arrives at a parking lot and must wait in line to get a ticket at a dispenser. As explained in paragraph 101, the user must validate the ticket at a fee collection machine and only thereafter can the user leave the lot by inserting the ticket in an automated gate for leaving. Paragraph 0120 is directed to a machine that can dispense entrance passes, such as National Park use passes. However, there is no disclosure of the passes ever being used to bypass an entrance line for either a parking lot or an amusement park. Again, the entrance passes are not prepurchased, but rather are purchased at a machine at the destination.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that Baranowski, Sim and Fulcher et al.,

considered alone and in combination fail to meet all of the limitations of claim 83. Dependent claim 83 should therefore be allowed, or if claim 70 is not also allowed, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate that claim 83 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 85, 89, 90, 92 and 93 depend from claim 83 and by definition contain all of the limitations of claim 83. Therefore, claims 85, 89, 90, 92 and 93 are allowable over Baranowski, Sim and Fulcher et al. for the reasons given above for claim 83 as well as because of the additional limitations contained therein.

For example, dependent claim 92 further limits the parking queue of claim 83. Claim 92 further requires pre-purchased parking passes, which are not taught nor inherent in Fulcher et al. The portions cited by the Examiner do not recite pre-purchased parking passes, and Applicants could not locate disclosure of pre-purchased parking passes elsewhere in Fulcher et al., Baranowski or Sim. Dependent claim 92 should therefore be allowed, or if claim 83 is not also allowed, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate that claim 92 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all limitations of intermediate claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 83, 85, 89, 90, 92 and 93 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 91 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 91 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baranowski (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,608) in view of Sim (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,786) and Fulcher et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0132288), and further in view of Waytena et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,978,770). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 91 depends from claim 83 and by definition contain all of the limitations of claim 83. Therefore, claim 91 is allowable over Baranowski, Sim and Fulcher et al. for the reasons given above for claim 83. Applicants respectfully submit that Waytena et al.

fail to remedy the defects of Baranowski, Sim and Fulcher et al..

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 91 is in condition for allowance and respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have earnestly tried to meet the substance of the Examiner's concerns, using the organization of the Examiner's groupings. We recognize that the both the Office Action, and this response are lengthy, and suggest that if there are remaining issues, a telephonic conference would be appropriate. We thank the Examiner for the attention evident in the Office Action.

A fee of \$1,020 is believed due for a three month extension of time to May 30, 2007 in which to respond. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge this fee and any additional fees which may be required to Deposit Account Number 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,
SHELDON MAK ROSE & ANDERSON PC

Date: May 30, 2007

By: /Marc Karish/
Marc Karish
Reg. No. 44,816

SHELDON MAK ROSE & ANDERSON PC
100 East Corson Street, Third Floor
Pasadena, California 91103-3842
Telephone (626) 796.4000
Facsimile (626) 795.6321
Customer No. 23676